



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/048,026 03/26/98 UCHINO

K 826.1482/JDH

EXAMINER

TM02/0123

STAAS & HALSEY
700 ELEVENTH STREET NW
SUITE 500
WASHINGTON DC 20001

PAULA, C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED:

01/23/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/048,026

Examiner

CESAR B PAULA

Applicant(s)

UCHINO ET AL.

Art Unit

2176

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 26 December 2000 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]


- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ In view of the early submission of the proposed reply (within two months as set forth in MPEP § 707.07 (f)), the period for reply expires on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, OR continues to run from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon the timely submission of a Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief with requisite fees.
3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (see Note below);
- (c) ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

4. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
5. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
6. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
7. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
8. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):
- Claim(s) allowed: _____.
- Claim(s) objected to: _____.
- Claim(s) rejected: 1-31.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.
9. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ a) ☐ has b) ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.
10. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No.(s).
11. ☐ Other:


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The Examiner is in disagreement with the Applicants contention that "nothing was cited indicating what would provide the requisite suggestion or incentive to one of ordinary skill to modify Numata" to show the display of the title and keywords in areas related to each other (p.10, pgph. 3). This newly added limitation of claims 1, 3, 8, 9, 16-17 will require further search and/or consideration.

Further, regarding claim 3, as the Examiner pointed out in the previous office action (p.6), Numata teaches the classification or grouping of documents. Numata fails to explicitly teach the display of cross references in each group of documents in a tree structure. However, Takano discloses the display of group of documents and their respective cross references as a parent-child structure--"tree structure"--and showing labels or abbreviated information for such document groups. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to had combined the teachings of Numata and Takano, because Takano discloses "a technology to make the process of navigation more effective by recognizing the content of the content files and the status of their relations in such a way directory servers can manage node data" (Col. 1, lines 51-60, and Col. 2, lines 17-29).

Furthermore, regarding claims 19 and 28-31, Applicants' remarks that "nothing was cited in any of the three references used to reject claims 19, and 28-31 describing cross-referencing of documents, or more importantly estimation of topic patterns" (p.11, pgph. 3). This newly added limitation was not considered in the previous office action, because it was not present in the last amendment, but it has just been added after the final action. This newly added limitation necessitates a new search and/or consideration.